



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,043	12/17/2001	David E. McDysan	RIC01059	5663
25537 VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909	7590 07/30/2010		<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>GYORFI, THOMAS A</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT</div> <div>2435</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>NOTIFICATION DATE</div> <div>07/30/2010</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>ELECTRONIC</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAVID E. MCDYSAN

Appeal 2008-005963
Application 10/023,043
Technology Center 2400

Before LANCE LEONARD BARRY, ST. JOHN COURTENAY III, and
CAROLYN D. THOMAS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BARRY, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL¹

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Patent Examiner rejected claims 1-24. The Appellant appeals therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a). We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

INVENTION

The Appellant describes the invention at issue on appeal as follows.

[A] plurality of ingress routers [are] coupled to egress routers for communication utilizing the network-based VPN [i.e., virtual private network] protocol that logically partitions intra-VPN and extra-VPN traffic, such that denial of service attacks on the access link originating from sources outside the VPN are prevented. In other words, traffic in a particular VPN is separated or partitioned based on the source of the traffic, i.e., whether the traffic originated within the VPN (intra-VPN) or outside of the VPN (extra-VPN).

(Appeal Br. 7.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLAIM

1. A network system providing a virtual private network (VPN), said network system comprising:

one or more egress routers having connections to an access network including an access link, wherein said one or more egress routers transmit intra-VPN traffic to a destination host belonging to the VPN from sources within the VPN within a first access network logical connection for intra-VPN traffic and all extra-VPN traffic to the destination host from sources outside the VPN within a second access network logical

connection for extra-VPN traffic, separate from the first access network logical connection; and

a plurality of ingress routers coupled to the one or more egress routers for communication utilizing a network-based VPN protocol that logically partitions intra-VPN and extra-VPN traffic, such that denial of service attacks on said access link originating from sources outside the VPN are prevented.

REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,768,271 ("Seid").

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Seid.

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over the Appellant's admitted prior art and Seid.


ISSUE

The Appellant stipulates that "all of the appealed claims stand or fall together as a group with exemplary independent claim 1." (Appeal Br. 6.) Therefore, we will decide the appeal of claims 1-24 based on claim 1 alone. The Examiner find that "Seid discloses a network system providing a virtual private network (VPN), said network system comprising: one or more egress routers having connections to an access network including an access link (Figs. 1-3)" (Ans. 3.) The Appellant argues that "Nothing, repeat nothing, is said about segregating, within the same VPN, intra-VPN traffic from extra-VPN traffic." (App. Br. 10.) Therefore, the issue before us is whether the Examiner erred in finding that Seid logically partitions intra-VPN and extra-VPN traffic by transmitting traffic from sources within

the VPN to a destination belonging to the VPN via a first access network logical connection and transmitting traffic from sources outside the VPN to the destination via a second access network logical connection.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Figure 1 of Seid follows.



"FIG. 1 is a schematic block diagram of a frame relay network having a plurality of prior art virtual private networks" (Col. 4, ll. 31-33.)

ANALYSIS

"It is axiomatic that anticipation of a claim under § 102 can be found only if the prior art reference discloses every element of the claim, and that

anticipation is a fact question" *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (citing *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. Am. Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1457 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Here, the network shown in Figure 1 of Seid logically partitions intra-VPN and extra-VPN traffic. More specifically, it transmits traffic from sources within VPN3 (viz., the rightmost and bottommost nodes in VPN3) to a destination belonging to the VPN (viz., the leftmost node in VPN3) via a first access network logical connection (viz., the double-headed arrows connecting the three nodes in VPN3). It also transmits traffic from sources outside the VPN (e.g., NODE D) to the destination (viz., the leftmost node in VPN3) via a second access network logical connection (viz., the double-headed arrow connecting NODE D to the leftmost node in VPN3).

Based on the aforementioned facts and analysis, we conclude that the Examiner did not err in finding that Seid logically partitions intra-VPN and extra-VPN traffic by transmitting traffic from sources within the VPN to a destination belonging to the VPN via a first access network logical connection and transmitting traffic from sources outside the VPN to the destination via a second access network logical connection.

DECISION

We affirm the rejections of claims 1-24.

Appeal 2008-005963
Application 10/023,043

No time for taking any action connected with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1). *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

rwk

VERIZON
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1320 North Court House Road
9th Floor
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909